

WHO'S RUNNING

THE FOUNDATION?

By Alice Widener

THE newest and biggest giant among philanthropic institutions is the Ford Foundation. Its assets are more than half a billion dollars, and its income in 1951 and again in 1952 exceeded 30 million dollars. During 1951 and 1952 the Foundation made appropriations of 75 million dollars.

Taxpayers as well as customers of the Ford Motor Company make possible the activities of this colossus even though they have no direct control over it. Most of the profits of the Ford Motor Company go to the Ford Foundation, which owns more than 90 per cent of the stock of that company. Whereas the Foundation is tax-free, under current tax laws the Company would pay up to 82 per cent on some parts of its income were it not diverted to the Foundation.

The Foundation is, of course, a trust for the public benefit. Therefore all Americans, as well as its car-buying benefactors, should take a good look at it.

Incorporated in Michigan on Jan-

uary 15, 1936, the Foundation was established to receive large parts of the fortunes earned by Henry Ford and his son Edsel, who were prompted by a desire to advance human welfare and were faced with the realities of taxation.

For twelve years the Foundation made gifts to institutions in the Detroit area and to other institutions of personal interest to the Ford family. In 1948, after the death of the principal donors, the trustees of the Foundation appointed a study committee of eight eminent educators to suggest how best to spend the vast sums soon to come from the Ford estates.

Two years later, after interviewing more than one thousand leaders from many aspects of American life, the study committee proposed and, in the words of Henry Ford II, "the trustees decided that the resources of the Foundation should be devoted to programs for the advancement of peace, education, the behavioral sciences, democratic institutions and economic stability."

Since this expanded program was adopted in September, 1950, nearly three years have elapsed. A preliminary evaluation is in order.

SO FAR, the Ford Foundation cannot justly be accused of hoarding its money or of inactivity. Quite the contrary. It has been furiously busy making grants to existing organizations and creating new ones for more or less specific purposes — the Fund for the Advancement of Education; the Fund for Adult Education; the Free Russia Fund (which was renamed the East European Fund); Intercultural Publications, Inc.; Resources for the Future; and the Fund for the Republic.

As the Foundation's five-point program begins to take shape, however, it presents disturbing facets. One has to do with personnel, particularly on the operational level. The trustees of the Foundation and the directors of the subsidiary funds and organizations enjoy vast prestige and respect, of course, although even at this top level a regrettable left-wing emphasis is apparent. Many are former New Deal bureaucrats.

The trustees and directors do not actually run the Ford organizations, however, even though they receive substantial yearly stipends. They are principally occupied with running business corporations, universities, banks, law firms, and scientific research projects not connected with the Ford Foundation, which is a side activity for them.

When a well-known journalist told a member of the board of directors of a magazine financed by the Ford fund that it was the target of widespread and justified adverse criticism, the director answered: "You know, I've got a couple of issues of the thing at home. But frankly, I've never had time to take a look at them."

The day to day work of the Ford Foundation is done by the various officers and staffs, and here the New Deal bias is much more marked. Until a few weeks ago, the president of the Foundation was Paul Hoffman, of Marshall Plan and ECA fame. He is still a trustee and chairman of the board of directors of the Fund for the Republic. One of four associate directors of the Foundation is another former ECA man, Milton Katz.

AT THE present writing, the man in charge of the New York office of the Foundation is Bernard L. Gladieux, who was assistant secretary in the United States Department of Commerce from 1945 to 1950. On February 6, 1953, Senator Malone of Nevada had some comments to make on the floor of the Senate concerning the departure of Mr. Gladieux from the Department of Commerce. Senator Malone said that in 1950 he . . .

. . . rose on this [the Senate] floor to suggest that certain persons in the Department of Commerce were dangerous security risks.

A committee was appointed for the purpose of investigating the charges. . . . After three or four days' hearing, Secretary of Commerce Sawyer rushed up to the Hill and agreed to fire the two men whom I had drawn into the net — Lee and Remington — if the hearing could be stopped.

I did not hear that agreement, but I know it was made, because I could never get the committee together again.

I was really after Mr. Gladioux [sic], secretary to the Secretary of Commerce, and Mr. Blaisdell. . . . They, Mr. Gladioux and Mr. Blaisdell, subsequently quit, for reasons best known to themselves — they knew we were on their trail.

Shortly thereafter the same Mr. Gladioux was employed in a key position by the Ford Foundation.

When asked about Senator Malone's statement, neither Mr. Gladioux nor the Ford Foundation had any comment to make.

The facts that William Remington was convicted of perjuring himself concerning his Communist connections and that Michael Lee (real name: Ephraim Zinovi Liberman) was repeatedly refused United States citizenship and was found to have falsified his application for governmental employment — these facts and Senator Malone's statement cause one to reflect upon Mr. Gladioux and the Foundation. What manner of person is finding haven on Ford Foundation payrolls? What investigations are being made to prevent Ford money — in whatever

form — from reaching subversives or being used for subversive purposes? We know it has happened before in other foundations.

Let us hope that the Foundation has better sources of leadership on these matters than its Associate Director Robert Maynard Hutchins, former controversial Chancellor of the University of Chicago. In 1949 Mr. Hutchins testified before a committee of the Illinois legislature investigating Communism at the University of Chicago. Speaking of that testimony, the late Congressman Eugene Cox said:

In that testimony I could not find any evidence of your being greatly disturbed, or maybe disturbed at all, over what the Communists were doing in our country, what they were doing in our great schools, in the school of which you are [sic] the head, and many others, and as to just what they were doing in Government.

In that testimony you virtually said that you knew little about Communism.

MISGIVINGS about the Ford Foundation also spring from some of the publications which it finances. Examine, for example, *World Affairs Are Your Affairs*, a book prepared for the Experimental Discussion Project of the Fund for Adult Education and copyrighted in 1952.

World Affairs Are Your Affairs lists nine books in its bibliography on India. One is *India and the United States* by Lawrence K.

Rosinger, which is described as being "limited to a careful presentation of facts. . ." In its report on the Institute of Pacific Relations (page 213) the Senate Internal Subcommittee said:

By three credible witnesses during these subcommittee hearings, Rosinger was identified as a Communist. When he was given an opportunity to deny these allegations he elected to refuse to testify on the ground that his testimony would tend to incriminate him.

The same McCarran Committee report also quotes a review of the Rosinger volume which accuses it of "underhand suggestion, vaguely formulated suspicion, cleverly dispersed innuendo—all under the mask of irreproachable objectivity. . ."

The books of other pro-Communist authors are listed in *World Affairs Are Your Affairs* without being so identified. Furthermore, the annotations falsely attribute an objectivity to many of the books that are written for a left-wing or worse propaganda purpose. Ford Foundation money is being used to mislead people to the Left.

Another publishing venture of the Foundation is a quarterly magazine entitled *Perspectives USA*, issued by Intercultural Publications, Inc. Printed in English, French, German, and Italian and distributed in some twenty-five foreign countries, the announced purpose of *Perspectives USA* is to foster world understand-

ing through the exchange of ideas.

According to the publisher, "Its editors will try to set materials before their readers that may enable them to view the culture of the United States in accurate *perspective*." In this the magazine fails, miserably and viciously. The contents are largely culled from the small literary *avant-garde* magazines which pride themselves on a lack of appreciation of contemporary American life as it is enjoyed by the vast majority of American citizens.

How the poems of E. E. Cummings in the Winter, 1953 issue can be translated—much less understood—by their foreign readers is a question hard to answer. I quote this "poem" exactly as it was printed:

l o o k —

pigeons fly ingand

whee(:are, SpRIN,k,LiNg an instant with sunLight then)1 —
ing all go BlacK wh-eel-ing

Aside from its unintelligibility and unsuitability to represent American life or culture, *Perspectives USA*, so far, has been a vehicle for the writings of many well-known pro-Communists.

Lionel Trilling, the guest editor of Issue No. Two of *Perspectives USA*, states that he chose for it the writings of American authors belonging to a group who "are especially aware of the social and political context in which the intellectual and creative

life is lived." Having identified himself with this group, Trilling said a typical member of it would say: "We are not trying to represent the American Spirit or the American Quality . . . We don't know what the American Spirit or the American Quality is, and we have no intention of trying to find out."

Obviously. The lead article chosen by Trilling is "America the Beautiful" by Mary McCarthy, who makes the Kremlin's three cardinal hate-America propaganda points: that Americans are crass, witch-hunting materialists; that we're a nation of war mongers; that we're a nation of racists. Mary McCarthy wrote:

1. The inalienable right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness appears, in practice, to become the inalienable right to a bathtub, a flush toilet, and a can of Spam.
2. . . . there is a great similarity between the nation with its new bomb and the consumer with his new Buick.
3. . . . Only among certain groups where franchise, socially speaking, has not been achieved, do pleasure and material splendor constitute a life-object and an occupation. Among the social outcasts — Jews, Negroes, racketeers and homosexuals — . . . the love of fabrics, gaudy show, and rich possessions still anachronistically flaunts itself.

Surely, this last quotation is one of the most vicious racist statements ever penned. How will foreigners

react to the evil bracketing of — *Jews, Negroes, racketeers and homosexuals*? How are Americans going to react? Will they accept this? Or will they issue strong protests to the Ford Foundation, which recently set up a \$15,000,000 Fund for the Republic with the announced purpose of protecting American civil liberties — and what seems to be a behind-the-scenes purpose of fighting individual U.S. Senators and the constitutional right of Congress to conduct investigations?

When Mr. Henry Ford II testified before a Congressional committee in Washington, November 24, 1952, he made the forthright, patriotic statement: "If anyone uses the funds of the Ford Foundation for un-American activities, we will never give them another dime." Americans have the right to know if the Ford Foundation is going to give another dime to *Perspectives, USA*.

As this writer sat in the Ford Foundation reception room on February 17, 1953, an executive from the administrative offices stood waiting with two companions for an elevator. "Did you hear the speech?" he asked. "The New Dealers have left Washington to the car dealers. Wow! Wasn't that great?"

I looked up at a portrait of Henry Ford I, car dealer.

The thought occurred to me that Henry Ford II, misled by the Foundation brain trusters, is trying to atone for all the sins his grandfather never committed.